```
DBE8CHEF
1
      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
      SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
 3
     CHEVRON CORPORATION,
 4
                     Plaintiff,
5
                                             11 Cv. 0691 (LAK)
                 V.
6
      STEVEN R. DONZIGER, et al.,
 7
                     Defendants.
 8
                                               November 14, 2013
9
                                               9:45 a.m.
10
     Before:
11
                            HON. LEWIS A. KAPLAN
                                               District Judge
12
                                 APPEARANCES
13
      GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
14
           Attorneys for Plaintiff
     BY: RANDY M. MASTRO
           ANDREA E. NEUMAN
15
           REED M. BRODSKY
           JEFFERSON E. BELL
16
           ANNE CHAMPION
17
      FRIEDMAN RUBIN
18
           Attorneys for Donziger Defendants
     BY: RICHARD H. FRIEDMAN
           DEE TAYLOR
19
20
     LITTLEPAGE BOOTH
           Attorneys for Donziger Defendants
21
     BY: ZOE LITTLEPAGE
           RAINEY BOOTH
22
      GOMEZ LLC
23
          Attorneys for Defendants Hugo Camacho, Javier Piaguaje
     BY: JULIO C. GOMEZ
24
25
```

```
1
               (Trial resumed)
 2
               THE COURT: Good morning.
 3
               Are we ready?
 4
               MR. MASTRO: Yes, your Honor. There has been an
 5
      agreement just reached this morning about Mr. Lipton's
6
      testimony so I am going to have my colleague Bob Blume
 7
     memorialize that.
 8
               MR. BLUME: Good morning, your Honor.
9
               We have met and conferred with defendants. They have
10
      agreed that we will put Dr. Lipton on to admit his direct exam
11
      through his witness statement, as well as two exhibits and a
12
      clarifying question. We then will agree to the admission of
13
      exhibits that defense would like to admit, and they will waive
14
      cross-examination of Dr. Lipton.
15
               THE COURT: So that's a short morning.
               MR. MASTRO: After that we will have a couple of other
16
17
      issues that we would like to address with the Court.
18
               MR. BLUME: At this time, we would like to call Dr.
19
      Lipton to the stand.
20
       JOSHUA LIPTON,
21
           called as a witness by the plaintiff,
22
           having been duly sworn, testified as follows:
23
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: State your name and spell your last
24
     name for the record.
25
               THE WITNESS: Joshua Lipton, L-I-P-T-O-N.
```

- 1 MR. BLUME: May I approach?
- 2 THE COURT: Yes.
- 3 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 4 BY MR. BLUME:
- 5 Q. Good morning, Dr. Lipton.
- 6 A. Good morning, sir.
- 7 Q. I have placed before you, sir, what has been previously
- 8 | marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit PX 5200. Do you see that, sir?
- 9 A. Yes, I do.
- 10 | Q. Is that a copy of your written declaration in this matter?
- 11 | A. Yes, it is.
- 12 | Q. Directing your attention, sir, to page 11 of that exhibit,
- 13 | is that your signature?
- 14 | A. Yes, sir, it is.
- 15 | Q. At the time you signed this declaration on October 9, 2013,
- 16 were the statements made therein true and accurate?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 | Q. Since you signed your declaration, Dr. Lipton, were certain
- 19 redactions made to it?
- 20 A. Yes. That's correct.
- 21 | Q. And also directing your attention to paragraph 26 of that
- 22 | declaration, did you change a word from "was" to "were"?
- 23 A. Yes, I see that, and I appreciate the grammatical
- 24 correction.
- 25 | Q. With those changes, Dr. Lipton, does everything in your

Lipton - direct

- declaration remain true and accurate? 1
- 2 Yes, it does. Α.
- 3 You offer that declaration as your direct testimony today?
- 4 Α. I do.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. BLUME: At this point, we would offer Plaintiff's Exhibit 5200 in evidence.

THE COURT: Just so we are clear, I take it that the portions with strike throughs reflect an agreement between the parties, and that the statement is now being received exclusive of the strike throughs, and there are no subsequent objections to deal with on this, is that right?

MR. FRIEDMAN: That is correct.

THE COURT: Mr. Gomez.

MR. GOMEZ: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: So it's received.

(Plaintiff's Exhibit 5200 received in evidence)

I have also placed before you, Dr. Lipton, two documents, one is labeled PX 5208 and one is labeled PX 5210.

Directing your attention first to PX 5208, do you recognize that as the written statement of Douglas Beltman?

- Yes, I do. This is a witness statement of Mr. Beltman to which I refer in my testimony.
- 23 Q. You refer to that in paragraph 33 of your witness 24 statement, sir, PX 5200?
- 25 Yes, that's correct. Α.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. I now direct your attention to Plaintiff's Exhibit 5210.

 Is that a written statement of Ann Maest?
 - A. Yes, it is. This is the statement of Dr. Maest to which I refer again in paragraph 33 of my testimony.

MR. BLUME: We would offer PX 5208 and PX 5210.

MR. FRIEDMAN: The agreement that we reached is that these are coming in not for the truth, but because he referred to them in his witness statement. So these are the witness statements he is referring to, but they are not coming in for the truth.

THE COURT: Mr. Blume, is that accurate?

MR. BLUME: While we agree they are true, we agree with that.

THE COURT: Mr. Gomez.

MR. GOMEZ: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: They are received for the fact that the statements were made at the time they were made and not for the truth.

(Plaintiff's Exhibits 5208 and 5210 received in evidence)

- Q. Dr. Lipton, in your declaration, PX 5200, you refer to a number of representations made by Mr. Beltman, is that right?
- 23 | A. Yes, I do.
- Q. Regarding those representations, sir, were they or were they not material to your decision to allow Mr. Beltman to

oversee the Stratus 1782 process and the defense of Stratus 1 2 Corporation? 3 A. Yes, they were, in fact, highly material and fundamental to 4 that decision. 5 MR. BLUME: At this point, we will pass the witness subject to the agreement we reached. 6 7 THE COURT: Which I take it there will be no 8 cross-examination. 9 MR. GOMEZ: That's correct, other than just to move 10 the particular documents that have been agreed to into the 11 record. 12 MR. BLUME: We have no objection. 13 The particular exhibits that are subject MR. GOMEZ: 14 of the agreement, your Honor, are Defendants' Exhibit 78, Defendants' Exhibit 80, Defendants' Exhibit 81, Defendants' 15 Exhibit 83, and Defendants' Exhibit 90. Defendants' Exhibits 16 17 78, 80, 81 and 83 are correspondence. I can go through them for the record. 18 19 THE COURT: May I see them? 20 MR. GOMEZ: Yes. 21 For the record, Defendants' Exhibit 90 is the Stratus 22 settlement agreement. 23 Is there any objection to any of them? THE COURT: 24 MR. BLUME: No objection.

THE COURT: They are received, 78, 80, 81, 83 and 90.

```
(Defendants' Exhibits 78, 80, 81, 83 and 90 received
1
 2
      in evidence)
 3
               THE COURT:
                          Anything else for this witness?
 4
               MR. BLUME:
                          That's it.
 5
               THE COURT: Dr. Lipton, you are excused.
 6
               (Witness excused)
 7
               THE COURT: What else?
               MR. MASTRO: Three other issues for this morning.
 8
9
               First, I wanted to report to the Court on Mr.
10
     Moncayo's hard drive imaging. Mr. Moncayo's attorney I believe
11
      is here in court. The mirror imaging of the hard drive was
      accomplished and filed with the court. There was also an
12
13
      imaging of his e-mail account. His attorney is someone known
14
      to me from past lives, both of us having been at the U.S.
15
      Attorney's Office, so I am accepting his representations.
      has mirror imaged Mr. Moncayo's e-mail account and represented
16
17
      to me that he will be reviewing the e-mail account, that the
18
      e-mail account was not separately filed with the clerk's
      office, but he has represented to me that he will, with that
19
20
     mirror image, review the e-mail account and produce any
21
      responsive documents to us and/or a privilege log on Monday.
22
               So I am accepting that representation, and we are
23
      willing to proceed on that basis vis-a-vis Mr. Moncayo.
24
               THE COURT: All right.
25
               MR. MASTRO: Now, your Honor, the second issue for
```

this morning is that we still have not received Mr. Donziger's written statement, although apparently others have.

THE COURT: The New York Times has it.

MR. MASTRO: I have talked to Mr. Friedman, and he has made certain representations to me. Perhaps he should make those on the record. Then I may have an additional application.

THE COURT: Mr. Friedman.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Your Honor, my client and co-counsel has authorized me to say that he will get a copy of the witness statement to Mr. Mastro by 6:00 or sooner today, that there may be some exhibit numbers and things that may be blank, but that he will have a physical statement to Mr. Mastro by 6:00.

THE COURT: Mr. Mastro.

MR. MASTRO: Your Honor, I am accepting Mr. Friedman's representation because it's Mr. Friedman.

THE COURT: He was very clear that what he was doing was repeating what he had been told to repeat.

MR. MASTRO: I understand, your Honor. If we get the statement today by or before 6:00, of course we are going to be ready to proceed on Monday, and I look forward to the cross-examination.

Your Honor, I wanted to say one other thing, which is regardless, it is obvious from what we all read this morning in The New York Times that Mr. Donziger shared a draft or drafts

of his statement with someone outside the context of any privilege, and I am asking the Court to require Mr. Donziger not only to produce to us by 6:00 today his final version of his statement, but also his drafts, because he has clearly waived privilege on his drafts, and I think that he should have to produce not only what he says is his final version of his statement, but he should have to produce his drafts, including what he give to Cliff Krauss at the New York Times instead of submitting it to this court and to us.

THE COURT: Mr. Friedman.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Your Honor, I don't know what was submitted to The New York Times. I have seen various drafts. I guess what I would say is I don't know how helpful it would be to do that. The goal it seems to me is to get a signed statement to Mr. Mastro of Mr. Donziger's statement. The pros and cons of whether there is a privilege that has been waived, I am just talking practicalities, not legal positions, I can't begin to think about which draft this would be and how that would be verified.

So I guess what I am asking is that we get the statement to Mr. Mastro at 6:00. If he feels like he wants to pursue this, we take it up then. He can see the draft. Everyone will know what we are working with at that point, and if he really thinks that getting the draft would be helpful, he can apply to the Court about that. From what I have seen, it's

going to be an exercise that will create a lot of energy and not much use to anybody. But that's my position.

THE COURT: Mr. Mastro.

MR. MASTRO: Your Honor, number one, highest priority is to get the statement, what he says is his final and full written statement of his direct testimony. So that's obviously the objective here.

I do think, at a minimum, that he should also be producing whatever he gave to Mr. Krauss. But our highest priority is to move the case forward and get his witness statement. It's just such an obvious waiver. It seems to me at a minimum he should have to produce that as well, but I just want to get the statement by 6:00 and whatever other material I am entitled to.

MR. FRIEDMAN: If I could state more clearly, I just hate to create another complication at this point, and I am not saying Mr. Mastro's position is well taken or not well taken, but I think when he gets the draft, I think he will be satisfied — not the draft. When he gets the final, he will be satisfied. That's my position.

THE COURT: I am not going to do anything about this right now. If the statement is produced by 6:00 and you want to pursue it, Mr. Mastro, talk to Mr. Friedman, and then we can deal with it in the morning if it needs to be dealt with.

If it does need to be dealt with, I rather imagine

that somebody better be prepared to address the question of how a lawyer handing a document to The New York Times, in circumstances where at least from the article there would appear to be some reason to think that the object of the exercise was to get ink favorable to the lawyer in question, could possibly not waive any work product protection there otherwise might have been for the draft, at least for the one handed to The New York Times. But maybe we don't have to get there and maybe you will educate me and I will have a different view. I haven't even formulated a view. It just seems to me confidentiality is very important to these things and The New York Times is not usually the way you maintain confidentiality.

What else?

MR. MASTRO: Your Honor, one final subject for today, which is the remaining witnesses on the defense side.

Your Honor, Javier Piaguaje, one of the defendants, was supposed to testify tomorrow morning. We have yet to receive his statement, although Mr. Gomez says it will be forthcoming later today. And Mr. Gomez is fine with under those circumstances, since we have yet to receive his statement, that we in fact hear from him and cross-examine him on Monday morning because we still don't have his statement of his written direct.

THE COURT: So there is no disagreement about that.

MR. MASTRO: There is no disagreement to just move him

to Monday morning.

Now, your Honor, that raises a separate question, which is that there are two other potential witnesses that Mr. Gomez said that he intended to call as of Monday morning, and that's defendant Camacho and a witness named Humberto Piaguaje. We also don't have witness statements from them. And in Mr. Humberto Piaguaje's case, we are entitled to a deposition over the weekend. I know Mr. Gomez says that he is waiting for them to arrive here and will work on their witness statements then, but I just wanted to clarify to the Court we don't have their statements yet and Mr. Piaguaje has to be deposed over the weekend before his testimony. I just wanted to make that clear on the record. We just want to advance this to conclusion so we are willing to work on very short schedules. We just wanted to clarify that for the record.

Then, finally, we have the situation with Ms. Calva, which remains open, and no representation one way or the other about whether she is going to appear.

On Mr. Piaguaje, Humberto Piaguaje, as well as Javier Piaguaje, both of whom purport to have roles with this thing called the assembly of the affected, we also, your Honor, want to make an application that the versions of minutes that have been provided to us, they were selectively chosen, including the January 15, 2013 meeting that your Honor will recall was the subject of some testimony at the sanctions hearing. We

have received selective portions of minutes from the assembly, a handful of dates that they have chosen to put in, heavily redacted. So every time Mr. Fajardo --

THE COURT: Get to the bottom line. What is it that you want?

MR. MASTRO: I want you to order them in advance of Mr. Piaguaje's deposition to give us the unredacted versions of the assembly minutes that they are offering or otherwise.

THE COURT: What is the problem with that, if there is one?

MR. GOMEZ: I will address the latter point first, and then I would like to be heard on the others.

The reason why the documents, the particular minutes are redacted are to preserve communications between counsel and clients. I redacted them personally, and I only redacted when the attorneys were speaking to each other and giving advice to their clients. That's why those portions are redacted. I requested all of the minutes. I received what I received and I produced everything that I received. I have not had the funding to translate everything that I received so we only have Spanish language versions of these minutes.

I have been making efforts to try to get more because I think that all parties would be served by a full and complete record of these minutes, but since I don't have control over them, all I can do is ask at this point. I will continue to

1	make	efforts.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: I understand that's your position, and you have undoubtedly read my opinion and findings.

MR. GOMEZ: I have.

So bottom line, your Honor, I am trying to continue to make efforts to produce more material that plaintiffs have asked for, and I will continue to do so.

In terms of the appearance of my witnesses --

THE COURT: Before we move off this subject, Mr.

Mastro, what is your response to that, if any?

MR. MASTRO: About how they redacted?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MASTRO: Your Honor, one, I think there are waiver issues here. Two, it seems to me that the kind of defense which they are arguing is they had these meetings where the attorneys came in and made a recommendation and then it was adopted. That's not a privileged communication from the attorney to them.

THE COURT: How much paper is there?

MR. MASTRO: How many minutes are there? There are 23 separate days of minutes.

THE COURT: How many pages?

MR. MASTRO: Each set of minutes is two to five pages, your Honor.

We will take the Spanish, your Honor. We can

```
1
      translate it.
 2
               THE COURT: I know you can.
 3
               MR. MASTRO: We will get translations to the Court
 4
      too.
 5
               THE COURT: Mr. Gomez, there is a problem here. They
      are entitled to have this material reviewed, as you know.
6
 7
      You're nodding affirmatively.
               MR. GOMEZ: I understand that.
8
9
               THE COURT: That's got to be done on a very tight
10
      timetable, and you're telling me they are all in Spanish, is
11
      that right?
12
               MR. GOMEZ: That's correct.
13
               MR. MASTRO: I am told the ones they have produced to
      us is English with redactions, so presumably the redactions
14
15
      have English in them, but the ones they produced to us are in
16
      English.
17
               THE COURT: Show me what they produced to you, Mr.
18
     Mastro.
19
               MR. MASTRO: Here is an example. January 15. We have
20
      English translations for everything but the portions redacted,
21
      your Honor, already done.
22
               MR. GOMEZ: Just so it's clear --
23
               THE COURT:
                           Just give me a minute.
24
               MR. MASTRO: They did produce it in Spanish.
```

THE COURT: What I have been handed, the whole

beginning of it looks like something somebody got from the Freedom of Information Act from the National Security Agency. It's mostly black. But it's all in English.

MR. MASTRO: The back part is Spanish.

THE COURT: So there is a translation.

Mr. Gomez, the redacted portions, have they been translated?

MR. GOMEZ: No, your Honor. Just for the record, your Honor, this is the most heavily redacted of the minutes. Most of the minutes are not redacted at all.

THE COURT: Then as to those, we don't have a problem. So what we are talking about is the ones as to which we have a problem.

I am just waiting to see whether I can find out quickly whether -- the answer is I can't find out quickly. I was trying to see if Judge Francis spoke Spanish, but I guess the answer is no, that is, no, we can't reach him.

MR. MASTRO: Your Honor, we are willing to pay for a translator to do this work, and then if there is going to be a submission to Judge Francis on privilege claims, we will pay for the translations.

THE COURT: What about that, Mr. Gomez? Suppose you hire a translator, you get the redactions translated very quickly into English. Mr. Mastro has offered to pay the translator. The translator gives you the product and then you

give the redaction, the full documents in English to Judge
Francis, if he is available, and we will find out today if he
is available, and he will deal with the privilege issues
relating to these documents. And if he is not available on
this timetable, we will go to plan B, and that will be one of
the special masters, depending on who is available.

MR. GOMEZ: I have no objection to a review of our privilege objections in camera.

THE COURT: You are to get these translated right away. Chevron will pay the bill. You can check back with Andy later in the day as to who is going to do it.

MR. GOMEZ: Very well.

THE COURT: What else?

MR. GOMEZ: I just want to make sure the record is complete. With respect to our inability to have witness statements as of this time, since I left court yesterday, I have been dealing with the situation regarding Mr. Moncayo's downloading of his hard drive, a process I understand took over ten hours yesterday. And during the course of that process, Mr. Moncayo was asked to provide credentials for his e-mail. His e-mail was then mirrored.

I am not casting aspersions on anyone who conducted the process. I am not saying that anything was done improperly. The problem that I have is the perception of Mr. Moncayo, where he was not simply kept informed about all the

steps that were being taken with his computer. Various people were connecting various different things to it. I am sure that was probably necessary. But, unfortunately, the fact that all of his e-mails, including personal e-mail, was imaged was of great concern to him.

THE COURT: I understand. But what was imaged, there are two copies, as I ordered. One is in the hands of Mr.

Moncayo's lawyer and the other is in the vault of this court.

MR. GOMEZ: That's correct.

THE COURT: Now, I can appreciate that somebody from another country might have some concerns, notwithstanding what we lawyers would all understand is not a problem, but we are talking here about witness statements for other people. Could we deal with that, if that's what you want to deal with?

MR. GOMEZ: We are making efforts to prepare them.

Javier Piaguaje is in the United States. I started to meet with him last night. I will continue to meet with him today and we will have the witness statement.

I do not know at this point whether Hugo Camacho and Humberto Piaguaje will take the stand as a result of what they have heard happened with Mr. Moncayo and the imaging of his personal e-mail. They obviously have privacy concerns, your Honor, and I am trying to do my best to persuade them that their testimony is valuable to these proceedings and they should take the stand.

THE COURT: I appreciate your efforts, but in the last analysis, your problem with your witnesses are your problems, they are not my problems. No doubt the other side could go on at vast length about their problems with their witnesses, and it's all very interesting to somebody some day. But unless there is something I am supposed to do about it, I'm not sure what the point is.

MR. GOMEZ: We will be working with the other side as best we can, and if it turns out that there are fewer witnesses, then there will just be fewer witnesses.

THE COURT: I understand.

Anything else this morning?

Mr. Friedman.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Just quickly. There has actually been many things that you haven't had to address.

THE COURT: I am relieved to hear that.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Mr. Seley and I have been talking and working on exhibits, and that part of the process, despite our initial and continued disorganization, is coming together.

Here is my request to the Court. We have given all of our defense exhibits, and they are being checked by the Chevron people against the hard drive electronic copy to make sure everything is fine. They are initialing each one. There is something like 2500 Chevron exhibits. If the Court would permit me, I would like to just stipulate to whatever the

number is, and we can do this on Monday. What I am trying to get out of is sitting for however many hours it would take to initial each of those exhibits and just stipulate that they are correct and accurate.

THE COURT: Here is why I am concerned. There is a vast amount of paper. There are in the case of just the witness directs a number of different versions that have floated around of one or another of these items. I have only one objective, and that is at the end of the day, there is not a dispute or an issue about what the record actually is, which ones came in, which ones didn't come in. That's the goal.

It seems to me that goal is best served by there being one definitive paper set with initials of counsel for both sides, all three sides, on the definitive copy. There is just too much potential for mischief here otherwise. I didn't mean that in a sense suggesting moral turpitude by anybody.

Confusion, mistake, error, and I apprehend the possibility that if, as and when there is ever an appeal, and I rather imagine that is inevitable no matter what happens here, the parties will be back before me 18 months from now fighting about which of several versions of some piece of paper is the one that was actually received. It's crazy to open this process up to that, and I won't.

Now, if you have got a better plan, I am all ears, but a general stipulation that says, well, you know, they are all

in, I don't understand how that solves anything.

MR. FRIEDMAN: This may be totally consistent with what you're saying. As I see it, there are, just like you said at the beginning of the trial, of the 2500 exhibits, only 100 maybe have been mentioned, maybe 200 in court by witnesses beyond the transcript. I am happy to sit and make sure those are all the same.

Then you have got however many additional, 2300 exhibits, that have not been mentioned, probably never will be mentioned again. And what I am willing to stipulate, if the Court will accept it, is that whatever that number is, that's what it is. I think the purpose of initialing the hard copy is so that there is agreement that exhibit —

THE COURT: That this is it.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ FRIEDMAN: That this is it. I am willing to stipulate that this is it.

THE COURT: The only problem is that kind of a stipulation does not include an agreement as to what "it" is.

Look, I don't want to waste any time of mine or yours doing a needless task. And if the collective intelligence of all the lawyers in this case, which is quite appreciable, can figure out something better, I am entirely receptive to minimizing whatever burden there is. But it needs to be definitive. And while it is true that at one point or another I may well have commented that you often get cases where there

are masses of exhibits and you wind up with 12 or 14 pieces of paper that really matter, that may not ultimately fit in this case. And in all my spare time during this trial, one of the things I have been doing, to some degree, is scrolling through the exhibits to see what is in this mound and reading them. I haven't finished. I am making no representations. I am certainly not giving interviews about how many I have left to read or anything else for that matter. But I mention it only because I imagine that we are going to have submissions and arguments at the end of the trial that are going to rely in some material way on exhibits that have never been mentioned in testimony.

MR. FRIEDMAN: That's true.

THE COURT: That's obviously true. So the "let's look at the 200 that were mentioned" solution is not intuitively, obviously, attractive, as sympathetic as I truly am.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Then what I would ask, unless we do come up with some other way to address the problem, if we could do that process of initialing the exhibits after closing argument so that -- it's going to take hours and hours, and I won't say any more.

THE COURT: Unless there is something I am overlooking, I don't think I should have a problem with that.

Mr. Gomez, do you have a problem with that?

MR. GOMEZ: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Mastro.

MR. MASTRO: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I will put you on a tight time frame after, but we can do it at the end.

 $\mbox{MR. FRIEDMAN:}\mbox{ We will do it the day after closing arguments.}$

THE COURT: That's fine.

MR. MASTRO: Your Honor, Mr. Friedman raises a point that I wanted to raise with the Court as well, which is, and the Court just mentioned it, closing arguments. I am not sure when the Court will want to do those, how close to the end of witness testimony will your Honor want to do that, and how much time will your Honor want to permit the parties? It is a bench trial so the closings are for the convenience of the Court, whenever the Court wants to hold them. We would certainly like an hour or so of closing time for each side. But it's really up to the Court and when the Court wants to have them. If the Court can give us any guidance on that, it will be extremely helpful.

THE COURT: What are the other views?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Assuming that we are done with Mr. Donziger sometime on Tuesday, which I think is probably a fair assumption, but I don't know, assuming that were the case, we would be ready to do closing arguments after a couple of hours of preparation. So if we finished him at 11:00 on Tuesday, we

would be willing to start closings that afternoon. I want to go home. That's basically what I am about here.

On the other hand, if Mr. Mastro wants to wait a day or so, that's fine, but I'd rather not drag it out. And an hour is plenty. We were going to ask the Court for 45 minutes. If Mr. Mastro wants an hour, we don't have a problem with that.

The thing is Mr. Gomez and I have a lot respect for each other, but we don't see eye to eye on a lot of issues, and I would ask that we -- I would like 45 minutes for me. I will let him speak for how much time he wants.

MR. GOMEZ: Your Honor, at least 24 hours for us to -MR. MASTRO: I object to a 24 hour closing.

MR. GOMEZ: I need at least a full day to go back and figure out what is in this case. I would also ask for equal time to close as opposed to splitting it between us.

THE COURT: I don't have any problem at all with three quarters of an hour for Mr. Friedman, three quarters of an hour for Mr. Gomez, and up to equal time for Chevron, an hour and a half, if you want it, and if you want to save part of that for rebuttal you can. If you don't want to save part of it for rebuttal, you can have a few minutes just to answer anything unexpected. Your call.

I will try to give you a day in between, but I am not promising now because I have scheduling issues. Obviously, I understand why you want it, and it's perfectly reasonable, and

25

I will try to accommodate it. 1 2 Anything else? 3 MR. MASTRO: Nothing further, your Honor. 4 Of course, we do have a rebuttal case, but it won't be 5 that long. 6 THE COURT: I forgot about that. 7 That does raise the question. I don't MR. FRIEDMAN: 8 know what your normal procedure is in a rebuttal case. Do we 9 get notice of who the witnesses are? Will there be witness 10 statements? 11 THE COURT: We resolved the second one yesterday. 12 think I indicated no. 13 MR. FRIEDMAN: That's true. 14 THE COURT: Will you get notice? 15 MR. MASTRO: We will. Again, how many witnesses we 16 end up calling will depend, in part, on whether Ms. Calva is 17 going to come here to testify, and I think Mr. Gomez indicated 18 that he would let the Court and us know by tomorrow what the resolution of that was. 19 20 MR. GOMEZ: That's correct. 21 THE COURT: I think that probably does it. 22 MR. GOMEZ: The only other issue that is outstanding 23 is Humberto Piaquaje appears on the plaintiff's initial

deposition. Therefore, it's our position that plaintiffs are

disclosures. As I understand it, he was not noticed for a

```
not entitled to take his deposition.
1
 2
               THE COURT: Mr. Mastro, do you agree that he was on
 3
      the initial disclosure?
 4
               MR. MASTRO: He was not on the defendants' initial
5
     disclosures. We listed many Ecuadorians who we thought might
      know something about this case, that we couldn't compel to be
6
 7
     here at all, as people that we had interest in. They didn't
      list him at all on theirs. And, your Honor, especially given
8
9
      that they haven't produced any documentation --
10
               THE COURT: Mr. Mastro, stop, please.
11
               Mr. Gomez, did you serve a 26(a) disclosure
12
      identifying Humberto Piaguaje?
13
               MR. GOMEZ:
                          No, your Honor.
14
               THE COURT: They get the deposition.
15
               MR. GOMEZ:
                          Thank you, your Honor.
16
               THE COURT: Anything else?
17
               MR. MASTRO: We will resume on Monday morning?
18
               THE COURT: I guess that's right.
19
               (Adjourned to November 18, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.)
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	INDEX OF EXAMINATION	
2	Examination of: Page	
3	JOSHUA LIPTON	
4	Direct By Mr. Blume	
5 PLAINTIFF EXHIBITS		
6	Exhibit No. Received	
7	5200	
8	5208 and 5210	
9	DEFENDANT EXHIBITS	
10	Exhibit No. Received	
11	78, 80, 81, 83 and 90	
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		